DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 310 SP 018 494

AUTHOR Newman, Katherine K.
TITLE Improving Teaching in Higher Education: A Review of Selected Literature. A Paper for The Collegial Assistance Program Task Force of the Texas Teacher Corps Network.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Educational Quality; *Faculty Development; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Schools of Education; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching Methods; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

The focus of the literature in this review is on schools of education and teacher educators. References are included on major works on the topics, and central questions and issues are raised. The factors which make it difficult to arrive at consensus about the quality of teaching in higher education are outlined along with various definitions of quality from several sources. Categories of teachers, their attitudes, teaching strategies, and characteristics are presented. Four different ways to confront the problem of upgrading teaching are explored: (1) discovering the most effective teaching method; (2) selecting and training higher quality teachers; (3) improving individual professor's teaching through inservice education and evaluation; and (4) offering innovative educational programs. Each strategy rises from a particular historical context and focuses on a distinct aspect of the dilemma. Major attempts to conceptualize faculty development are reviewed, and examples of improvement programs in the past decade are offered with summaries of the impact of such programs and current issues affecting them. Literature on the process and techniques of clinical supervison is reviewed, and the problems and issues involved in this kind of supervision are discussed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204310

IMPROVING TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Katherine K. Newman
Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
University of Houston, Central Campus

Farish Hall 256
4800 Cullen Blvd.
Houston, TX 77004

a paper for
The Collegial Assistance Program Task Force
of the
Texas Teacher Corps Network
March, 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katherine K. Newman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 018 494

Contents

1. Introduction 1

2. Defining Excellence in Teaching 3

3. Approaches to Improving Teaching 9

    Methods 9

    Selection 11

    Improvement of Individuals' Teaching 11

        Literature on Teaching 11

        Faculty Evaluation 13

    Innovative Programs 16

4. Faculty Development Programs 17

    Faculty Development: Past and Present 17

    Examples of Programs 20

    Impact 24

    Current Issues 25

5. Clinical Supervision 27

    General Literature 27

    Research 32

    Issues 33

6. Bibliography 35

As part of a project to improve teaching in the schools, colleges, and departments of education of the member institutions of the Texas Teacher Corps Network, the Task Force for the Collegial Assistance Program agreed on the desirability of conducting a review of professional literature in as many of the following areas as possible.

1. What descriptive data exist regarding the teaching behaviors of teacher educators? How do they use time and materials in the classroom? What mechanisms are available to provide them feedback about their teaching? Do teacher educators use team approaches in curriculum development and teaching? What are the dimensions of effective or high quality university teaching? Is there a relationship between teaching style and personality?

2. What methods and/or procedures show evidence or promise of improving instruction in higher education? What are the differences in effect of self-supervision, supervision by one person, and peer team supervision? Do student or administrative evaluations improve instruction? Do institutional priorities and teaching loads influence the quality of instruction?

3. What are the common forms of faculty development programs in higher education? Is collegial assistance a common part of faculty development programs? Do professors desire and seek assistance in all areas of professorial responsibility? What incentives promote participation in faculty development programs? What factors inhibit participation in faculty development programs? Are institutional priorities reflected in faculty development programs?

4. Have clinical supervision processes been effective in improving instruction at any level of schooling? What factors inhibit the implementation, institutionalization, and maintenance of clinical supervision programs?

5. What analytical tools for studying teaching are available?

Because of the breadth of the field to be covered, this review of literature does not claim to be exhaustive. It does, however, include reference to major works in each area, and it raises the central questions and issues. Section Two, "Defining Excellence in Teaching," outlines the factors which make it difficult to arrive at consensus about quality in teaching in higher education. Then definitions from several sources are briefly explored, and typologies of teachers are presented. Section Three, "Approaches to Improving Teaching," presents four very different ways to confront the problem of upgrading teaching. Each approach arises from a particular historical context and focuses on a distinct aspect of the dilemma.

Section Four, "Faculty Development Programs," reviews the major attempts to conceptualize faculty development and offers several examples of programs implemented in the past decade. Attempts to study the impact of such programs are noted, and the current issues are summarized. Section Five, "Clinical Supervision," reviews the literature explaining the process and techniques of this kind of supervision, and discusses the limited research which has been conducted. The problems and issues involved in the concept of clinical supervision are discussed.

Defining Excellence in Teaching

The question, "What is excellent teaching?" is either avoided or debated by persons who have spent their lives in both the practice and study of teaching. Some will face the question squarely and proffer beliefs; they may answer in abstractions and poetry or in the recital of specifics. Others study and evaluate teaching, but leave their definitions of good teaching for the reader to infer. Still others have collected data systematically in the attempt to compile a clear description of excellence in teaching.

The tendency to avoid or debate the question is quite understandable, given the nature of teaching. Ryans (1960) noted that "two very important reasons why effective and ineffective teachers cannot be described with any assurance are the wide variation in the value concepts underlying the descriptions of desirable teaching objectives and the differences in teacher role at different educational levels, in different subjects, and with different pupils." (p. 371)

Higher education faculty show wide variation in their stated goals for undergraduate education, according to Wilson and Gaff (1975): faculty in three California institutions set their priorities as diversely as "knowledge and skills directly applicable to student careers," "understanding and mastery of some specialized body of knowledge," and "self-knowledge and personal identity." (p. 20) Indeed, higher education has a range of purposes, from educating philosophers to training dental hygienists, from cultivating poets to preparing kindergarten teachers. The attainment of these goals can not be measured simply in the confines of each college course. Higher education, as with elementary and secondary schooling, yields what Dreeban (1970) calls an intangible product; we can not be certain about the long-range effects of education on students.

The sheer complexity of the teaching process makes the definition of good teaching elusive. Definitions are framed in terms of the teachers' characteristics, beliefs, teaching behaviors, or methods used, or their focus on students' learning abilities and styles, or teachers' adjustment to contextual conditions, or student achievement. With this brief caveat, the definitions of excellent teaching may be explored.

Buxton and Prichard, in Excellence in University Teaching (1975), compiled 25 provocative essays on teaching written by professors identified as outstanding teachers. The essays range from discussions of deep, personal teaching ideals to specific methods to general reflections on the current state of teaching in higher education. The book appears to be based on the belief that good teaching can be understood by listening to excellent teachers reflect on their teaching.

Improving College Teaching, edited by Calvin B. T. Lee (1967), is a collection of essays and commentaries in the areas of academia, professors, teaching and learning, evaluation of teaching, and curriculum reform. The notions of "excellent teaching" which emerge in the essays are recurring themes in professors' writing about teaching. Nisbet makes a strong case that "teaching, above all, is something that is important to say" (p. 30), and urges that active junior minds be brought in contact with active senior minds. Commenting on Enrico Fermi's teaching of freshman physics, he notes, "We do not know how he taught; only that, like Mt. Everest, he was there, to be, so to speak, scaled by his students." (p. 31)

Arrowsmith, also in Lee's edition, decries our culture's misconception of teacher as producer and disseminator of knowledge. We have forgotten that the purpose of education is "the molding of men." (p. 58) "We lack educators, by which I mean Socratic teachers, visible embodiments of the realized humanity of our aspirations, intelligence, skill, scholarship; men ripened or ripening into realization ." (pp. 59-60) The teacher "is the student's only evidence outside

the text that a great humanity exists." (p. 60) For Arrowsmith, excellent teaching is defined by the profound humanism of the teacher.

Gilbert Highet's classic, The Art of Teaching (1950), provides specifics of good teaching. The good teacher, says Highet, knows and likes his subject, knows and likes students, and possesses an able memory, will-power, and kindness. The book includes discussions of methods and great teachers.

An entirely different approach to the defining of good teaching is represented by scholars who have conducted systematic studies in the subject. Cohen, Trent, and Rose, in Travers' Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (1973), summarized research in these efforts in their section on "Evaluation of Teaching" (p. 1041) in the chapter on higher education. Research correlating teacher behavior with student learning and/or rating was sparse. Research to develop an outstanding teacher composite from students and/or professors yielded contradictory results. (p. 1043) Studies in which student ratings were used to determine characteristics of effective teachers in higher education were more productive. Five major factors emerged from two series of studies, Eble (1970) and Hildebrand and Wilson (1970):

1. Clarity of organization, interpretation and explanation;
2. Encouragement of class discussion and the presentation of diverse points of view;
3. Stimulation of students' interests, motivation and thinking;
4. Manifestation of attentiveness to and interest in students;
5. Manifestation of enthusiasm. (p. 1044)

These summaries of various attempts to define excellence in teaching reveal several types of inquiry used to confront the question. Despite their mode of inquiry, many writers conclude that there is more than one kind of good teaching.

Joseph Axelrod, in The University Teacher as Artist (1973), reports an

interview study of more than one hundred college and university humanities faculty members. He asked them to describe their vision of the most effective teaching style and those occasions when their greatest success in teaching had been attained. The results were two major categories of the professors' mental images of teacher-at-his/her-best. The first category, didactic modes, involves teaching in which inquiry is not required of the student; the teacher is a craftman. The second category, the one to which Axelrod devotes his book, he terms evocative modes; the teacher is an artist. (p. 9) The four evocative modes are summarized here.

1. Principles-and-facts prototype. This teacher believes his or her function is to present information to the student, cover the subject thoroughly, and stimulate the student's further inquiry. The motto is, "I teach what I know."

2. Instructor-centered prototype. These teachers see themselves as expert inquirersin their fields, and rather than cover material systematically, they sample selected problems through which they can demonstrate their quality of inquiry. Their motto is, "I teach what I am." Students must accomodate themselves to the professors.

3. Student-as-mind prototype. These professors see their primary function as helping students perform complex intellectual skills rather than making them conform to subject or professor. Their motto is, "I train minds."

4. Student-as-person prototype. These professors concern themselves with students' growth as persons. They see intellectual development as inseparable from emotional, aesthetic and other development. Their motto is, "I work with students as people." (pp. 42-43)

Through discussion of his interviews and analysis of professors' in-class transcripts, Axelrod shows the manifestations of these prototypes in the ways professors teach. While acknowledging that both didactic and evocative modes can be implemented with high sophistocation, Axelrod himself values the evocative mode and argues that teacher-artists are the only hope for the future success of higher education. (p. 228)

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) review Mann's (1971) typology of effective

teaching styles.

1. Teacher as expert. This teacher is defined in terms of his or her knowledge, experience and wisdom with respect to the subject matter.

2. Teacher as formal authority. The teacher demonstrates his or her responsibility to the institution through maintaining uniform standards and a justifiable grading system.

3. Teacher as socializing agent. The teacher represents the occupational field to which the students aspire. He or she exemplifies the values, assumptions and intellectual life of the discipline.

4. Teacher as facilitator. The teacher attempts to determine the strengths, needs and goals of the students.

5. Teacher as ego ideal. The teacher is used by students in their process of forming and approaching their ideals.

6. Teacher as person. This teacher forms trusting relationships with students covering extra-classroom as well as classroom matters. (summarized from Bergquist and Phillips' pp. 10-11 quotation of Mann)

Leonard Baird (1973) looks at the teacher from five different perspectives as he compiles five models for teacher evaluation in higher education. The first three are influenced by learning theory; the last two are derived from faculty institutional roles.

1. Standard model. The teacher establishes objectives, determines materials and techniques for implementation, and assesses progress toward the objectives.

2. Teacher as organizer of cognitive learning tasks. Using principles of Ausubel, Gagne, Bruner and others, the teacher arranges materials and activities in the structure most readily acquired by students.

3. Teacher as reinforcer of desired behavior. The teacher skillfully engineers the steps in the learning process, e.g., specifying expectations, arousing motivation, providing immediate feedback, allowing progress at the students' own rate, avoiding excessive frustration, promoting transfer of learning.

4. Teacher as role performer. The professor attempts to meet the often ambiguous or conflicting expectations of students, colleagues in the institution and throughout the discipline, and his or her administrative superiors.

5. Teacher as a member of a total environment. The teacher exists within the individual culture of his or her institution, and contributes efforts to reaching the goals of the institution. (summarized from pp. 78-94)

Baird advocates viewing teaching from these perspectives,"from a formal model of the process of teaching to a broad assessment of the environmental field of forces on the teacher" (p. 95)

Approaches to Improving Teaching

Approaches to improving teaching in higher education are as varied as the reasons for undertaking such improvement. In this section four approaches are considered: discovering the "best" methods for teaching; selecting and training higher quality teachers; improving individual professors' teaching through inservice education and evaluation; and offering innovative educational programs.

Methods

Much of the literature on improving college and university teaching focuses on teaching methods. The impetus for improvement through method comes from the desire to increase student learning. The growth in this century of the fields of psychology and learning theory, as well as the advent of sophisticated technology applicable to teaching, has led to a series of studies comparing the efficacy of various instructional methods.

Dubin and Taveggia (1968) reviewed 91 comparative studies of college teaching methods including lecture, discussion, computer-assisted instruction, and television from 1924-1965. The authors report, "These data demonstrate clearly and unequivocally that there is no measurable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations". (p.35)

Cohen, Rose, and Trent in Travers' Second Handbook of Research on Teaching devoted a section of the chapter on higher education to "Teaching Technology and Methods." (1973) The media studies which they reviewed showed that technologists' high hopes for media in education were as yet unrealized.

Studies investigating lecture and discussion indicated that student characteristics and learning styles were related to the success of each method. Studies on the effectiveness of team teaching had mixed results. Investigations of tutoring demonstrated its effectiveness. (pp. 1023-35)

Kulik and Kulik's chapter, "College Teaching," in Peterson and Walberg's Research on Teaching (1979), focuses on methods. Summarizing five reviews of research on lecture and discussion, they note no difference in the two methods for factual learning, but the superiority of discussion for attaining higher cognitive objectives. (pp. 71-72) Recent research on instructional media, programmed instruction, and computer-based teaching, confirm earlier findings, i.e., no consistent differences between these and conventional methods. (p. 76)

Keller's Personalized System of Instruction, according to Kulik and Kulik's review of research, has consistently demonstrated superiority over traditional methods in college student learning, both for high and low-aptitude students, and on objective and essay tests. (p. 84) The authors offer evidence that the components of effective college teaching are frequent quizzing, immediate feedback, and required remediation. (pp. 84-88) They urge that further attempts to improve college teaching be based on how students carry out their individual study as opposed to how they are taught in groups in classrooms.

The proponents of improving teaching by finding effective methods have moved from simple comparisons of methods to aptitude-treatment interaction and to focus on students' study processes. In one of the earlier reviews of research on college teaching, Mc Keachie (1967) concludes with the implications of the findings for college teachers:

> With freedom to adapt teaching to achieve goals with the infinite variety of students, teaching becomes an art--an art that builds upon knowledge and skill.... As we gain in our understanding, our teaching will be illuminated with new insight, delight, and mastery. (p.231)

Selection

For a time in the 1960s, when college enrollment was increasing and higher education was expanding, a solution proposed for the improvement of teaching was the recruiting and selection of persons with high potential or demonstrated success as instructors in their fields. Concern about ineffective teaching focused on the large numbers of new faculty entering college classrooms with little notion of how to teach.

Graduate training in teaching was suggested for future professors in all areas. Mc Grath (1964) and Mc Carthy (1964) are proponents of this view. In recent years, as the supply of new faculty has come to exceed the demand and as faculties age, efforts to improve teaching have tended more toward seasoned faculty than beginners.

Improvement of Individuals' Teaching

A third approach to the upgrading of college and university teaching is to improve the teaching of individual faculty members. This section first considers the variety of books on teaching aimed at the professoriate. Then there is a discussion of the approach on which the greatest volume of professional literature has been produced, namely, the upgrading of college and university teaching through evaluation of professors.

Literature on Teaching

There are several general books on college teaching. Some aim to inspire by recalling the noble purpose of teaching; Buxton and Prichard's (1975)

volume of essays by outstanding teachers is in this category. Some are collections of writings giving broad coverage to the academic community, the roles of professors, curriculum and methods, college students, and the evaluation of teaching; Estrin and Goode (1964) and Lee (1967) are examples. Some books explain general traditional and/or innovative teaching methods, e.g., Davis' Teaching Strategies for the College Classroom (1976) with chapters on systems, lecture, inquiry, and group process, and Milton and Associates' On College Teaching (1978), covering lecture, discussion, Personalized System of Instruction, computers, contracts, simulation, field experience, and other approaches. Some volumes more closely resemble handbooks; they offer suggestions for handling course planning, methods selection, classroom performance, and grading. Eble's The Craft of Teaching: A Guide to Mastering the Professor's Art (1976) is an example.

Finally, there is a genre of satirical and cynical books intended to enlighten professors about the realities of teaching in higher education: they are vividly entitled The Professor Game, Scaling the Ivory Tower, and This Beats Working for a Living, but for the purpose of this paper their authors shall go unnamed.

For a more detailed categorization and discussion of books on college teaching see, Davis' (1976) bibliographic essay. He discussed literature in the following categories.

1. Studies sponsored by professional associations
2. Exhortations to better teaching
3. General books on college teaching
4. Practical handbooks and books on methods

5. Books on theories of learning
6. Explications of a particular approach to teaching
7. Books about using media
8. Summaries of research studies on college teaching
9. Guidebooks for evaluating teaching
10. Books on faculty development
11. Books about the profession of professor
12. Books on special aspects of college teaching (pp. 113-32)

Faculty Evaluation

The evaluation of professors for the purpose of improving instruction is a complex topic. For decades the evaluation of professors' teaching, scholarship and service has been carried out in order to make decisions about tenure, promotion, and merit recognition. The relationship of evaluation to the actual improvement of teaching remains unclear. Several contextual conditions cloud the issue. Traditionally in higher education there has been the widespread belief that excellent teaching is expertise in subject matter; this has led to the evaluation of professors' teaching by judgment of their scholarship. Furthermore, a widely-held belief that the act of teaching belongs in the realm of art, not of science, has resulted in reluctance to develop specific criteria to be used in judging teaching. In addition, the recognition of the varied kinds of positive impact of professors on students has led to hestitation in applying the same criteria to every teacher. Evaluation has been conducted amidst the genteelly fierce independence of academics.

The policies and practices used in the evaluation of teaching were surveyed in two studies. Gustad (1967) surveyed over 500 colleges and universities in 1961 about the sources of information used to evaluate

teaching. The ten most frequently mentioned sources were as follows:

1. Chairman evaluation
2. Informal student opinions
3. Classroom visits
4. Colleagues' opinions
4. Systematic student ratings
6. Dean evaluation
7. Student examination performance
8. Informal methods
9. Course syllabi and examinations
10. Long-term follow-up of students (p. 270)

In 1966 Astin and Lee (1967) did a follow-up of Gustad's study. They surveyed over 1,200 instutions, and found a shift in the most frequently used sources.

1. Chairman evaluation
2. Dean evaluation
3. Colleagues' opinions
4. Scholarly research and publications
5. Informal student opinions
6. Grade distributions
7. Course syllabi and examinations
8. Committee evaluation
9. Student examination performance
10. Self-evaluation or report (p. 298)

Classroom visits and systematic student ratings declined in use over the five-year period, while scholarship, grade distributions, committee evaluation, and self-evaluation increased. As Astin and Lee noted, there was heavy reliance on hearsay evidence. The use of scholarship as a criterion for teaching, Astin and Lee maintained, blurs the distinction between the two and seriously confuses the assessment of teaching. (pp. 298-99) Although the studies named sources of evidence about teaching, they did not gather information about the criteria involved.

Only in the past several years has progress been made to use evaluation more systematically to improve teaching. Given the sources of data from the

Gustad and Astin and Lee studies, several specific mechanisms for the improvement of teaching may be described. Miller (1972), in Evaluating Faculty Performance discusses three which can be implemented for the dual purpose of assessing effectiveness and promoting improvement:

1. Student evaluation. Using forms which have been carefully designed and tested, the teacher administers the instrument early in the term in time to make modifications in his or her teaching.

2. Classroom visitation. A senior faculty member observes the class of a junior member, after first having conferred about the past history and the current purposes of the class. The observer keeps detailed notes and later confers with the junior member.

3. Self-evaluation. The professor both keeps informal notes and fills out a formal self-appraisal form. (summarized from pp. 26-38)

Eble (1972) notes an increase in the use of student ratings of professors (p. 59), and several recent studies have investigated this new emphasis. Cohen, Trent and Rose in Travers' Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (1973), concluded that student evaluation of college teachers, when systematically conducted, yields reliable information on: 1) a teacher's personal effectiveness, 2) teacher-student rapport, and 3) the organization and management of a particular course. (p. 1047) The authors also concluded, on the basis of several studies reviewed, that student ratings can be effective in stimulating teaching improvement. (p. 1046) Costin, Greenough and Menges (1971) in a more extensive review of research on student ratings, also found that such ratings can be reliable and valid, and that they can effectively influence a professor to improve his or her teaching. Doyle's Student Evaluation of Instruction (1975)

details the development and responsible use of student ratings.

Innovative Programs

While some may approach the upgrading of teaching through the improvement of methods, teacher selection, or teacher performance, other educators have thought of teaching improvement as the making of major alterations in the educational experience offered in higher education. The 1960s were an impetus to this kind of change; rebellious and disenchanted students denounced traditional education as irrelevant. Dramatic alternatives had to be found.

Milton's Alternatives to the Traditional (1973) described off-campus educational programs and interdisciplinary studies. Cohen, Rose and Trent (1973) revealed that despite new developments in college curricula and in experimental colleges, little research has documented their effects. (pp. 1032-35) It is not clear whether these innovations met their originators' expectations of improving the teaching function of colleges and universities.

Ralph and Freedman (1973) studied faculty growth in innovative colleges in which students and faculty participated in an eqalitarian process of making decisions about the content and structure of the new educational experiences. The innovative colleges they studied were interdisciplinary in curriculum and aimed to promote the growth and development of the participants as whole individuals. Ralph and Freedman found that as professors operated with these radically different assumptions about authority, their academic discipline, and educational goals, they experienced the pain and joy of growth. One may infer that the demands of a new form of academic life had promoted improvement in their teaching more intensely than formal inservice education, staff development or faculty evaluation.

Faculty Development Programs

Having considered various views on what excellent teaching is and how to improve teaching in higher education, we now turn to faculty development programs and practices. First, evidence about past and present inservice practices is discussed, and conceptualizations of faculty development are presented. Then examples of several programs are briefly described. Attempts to assess the impact of faculty development are summarized, and finally the current issues from faculty development in the late 1970's are examined.

Faculty Development, Past and Present

In 1950, W. F. Kelley reviewed twenty studies of inservice education in colleges and universities between 1927 and 1948. He found eleven procedures mentioned in more than half the studies:

1. Supervise teaching
2. Provide time for research
3. Use outside consultants, lecturers, experts
4. Use student evaluation of instruction
5. Sponsor cooperative faculty groups interested in instruction
6. Schedule faculty meetings to clarify purposes and heighten morale
7. Plan intervisitation of classes
8. Encourage further study
9. Have departmental meetings to define course purposes and presentations
10. Facilitate participation in learned societies
11. Reward good teaching through promotional and salary policy (summarized from pp. 351-58)

Twenty-five years later, Centra (1978b) surveyed over 700 institutions of higher education about their faculty development practices. Of the institutions, 44% had designated a unit or a person responsible for faculty development or instructional improvement. The median number of years such a program had existed was only 2.3. (p. 160) In the same study Centra (1978a) determined the most frequently used policies and practices in five categories.

1. Institution-wide policies and practices. Used by well over half the institutions were:

a. travel funds for conferences
b. periodic review of faculty
c. unpaid leaves for development
d. circulation of material related to teaching improvement
e. sabbatical leaves
f. temporary load reductions for further work
g. there is a campus committee on faculty development

2. Analysis or Assessment Practices. Student ratings were in wide use. In use to some extent on many campuses were analysis of in-class videotapes, and growth contracts (individual development plans).

3. Workshops, Seminars and Similar Presentations. Most used were topics of specific instructional techniques and new knowledge in a field.

4. Media, Technology, and Course Development Practices. Audiovisual specialists were in frequent use.

5. Miscellaneous Practices. Widely used were gra[illegible] to develop different approaches to teaching. Taking courses offer[illegible]y colleagues was also a wide-spread practice. (summarized from pp. [illegible]6)

One may infer from comparing Kelley's and Centra's studies that the recent burgeoning of faculty development programs has not much altered earlier practices.

Three conceptualizations of faculty development are frequently cited in the literature. Centra derived his categories from the study described above. He conducted a factor analysis of his data and determined four groups of development practices which "seemed to define patterns of estimated use of the practices among the institutions." (1978b, p. 154)

Group 1: High Faculty Involvement. These were practices in which a high proportion of faculty participated. Many were run by faculty. They included:
a. workshops to acquaint faculty with the institution
b. senior faculty work closely with new teachers
c. informal assessment
d. self assessment

Group 2: Instructional Assistance Practices, for example:
a. specialist to assist in course development, developing teaching skills, or constructing tests
b. specialists to asist with instructional technology

Group 3: Traditional Practices, for example:
a. visiting scholars
b. teaching awards
c. sabbatical leaves
d. seminars for improving research

Group 4: Emphasis on Assessment, for example:
a. periodic review
b. travel funds
c. student ratings
d. formal evaluation by colleagues or administrator (summarized from p. 155)

Jerry Gaff's Toward Faculty Renewal (1975) is one of the definitive books on faculty development in the 1970's. He offers a conceptualization of the field, and discusses promising current programs in terms of their organization politics, financing, staff, and impact. Gaff posits three alternative conceptions of instructional improvement.

1. Faculty Development. With a focus on faculty members, this approach aims to help them acquire knowledge, skills, sensitivities and techniques related to teaching. Typical activities are seminars, workshops, and evaluation.

2. Instructional Development. With its focus on courses and curriculum, this approach aims to improve student learning. Typical activities are producing materials, redesigning courses, and workshops on objectives or evaluation.

3. Organizational Development. With a focus on the organization, the purpose of this approach is create a positive environment and improve interpersonal relationships. Typical activities are workshops for group leaders and members, and task forces to revise organizational policies. (summarized from pp. 8-10)

A similar categorization of faculty development has been elaborated by Bergquist and Phillips (1975) and Bergquist (1978).

1. Instructional Development. The authors suggest that faculty development begin with this primary function. This approach may proceed through evaluation (student; self; peer; portfolio), instructional diagnosis, training in instructional methods, and course and curricular design.

2. Organizational Development, which proceeds through training in decision-making and conflict-management, team building, and management training.

3. Personal Development, in which faculty members reexamine their goals and improve interpersonal skills, creativity, and risk-taking. In this domain activities include discussions about teaching, life planning, professional growth contracts, interpersonal skills training, personal growth workshops, and counseling. (summarized from Bergquist, 1978, pp. 19-24)

Rather than seeing these as alternative approaches, Bergquist noted that all three domains are necessary for an effective faculty development program. Bergquist and Phillips' A Handbook for Faculty Development (1975) explains each domain and its activities in detail.

Smith (1976) describes and gives examples of four organizational forms of faculty development programs: 1) university programs; 2) college consortia; 3) statewide programs; and 4) regional consortia. (pp. 37-49)

Examples of Programs

For sources describing a number of faculty development programs, these references are especially useful: Gaff (1975), Bergquist (1978), Alexander and Yelon (1972), Smith (1976), and Change Magazine's Yellow Pages of Undergraduate Education. Some examples of programs follow:

Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development. Using the IDEA system, instructors identify their own objectives for a particular course and have students assess their progress toward these goals. (Bergquist, 1978, p.20) Student ratings are then followed up by teaching improvement activities for instructors, either in small groups or individually. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 39-43; Hoyt and Howard, 1978)

University of Massachusetts, Clinic for the Improvement of University Teaching. Using the TABS instrument (Teaching Analysis by Students), faculty rate their own teaching and predict their students' ratings. Faculty and student ratings are compared. Trained consultants use the ratings, observation, and diagnosis of individual instructors to assist in their teaching development. (Bergquist, 1978, p.20, and Melnik and Sheehan, 1976)

Virginia Commonwealth University, Teaching Laboratory, established by J. Noonan. Faculty members voluntarily obtain descriptive, not evaluative, feedback about their in-class teaching by observors trained in the observation of teaching

and in helping relationships. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 43-44)

University of Wisconsin, Green Bay. The program monitors students' experiences and reactions to courses as well as providing services for instructional improvement. Faculty are continuously informed about the research on students. (Gaff, 1975, p. 45)

Great Lakes College Association, Consortial Experiment in Faculty Development. The program provides teaching fellowships in which faculty with potential for growth in teaching are commissioned for a year to work toward their own goals and to stimulate interest in teaching on their home campuses. The program also provides a consultant service, interinstitutional workshops on teaching issues, and external program evaluations. (Smith, 1976, pp. 41-43)

University of Texas at Arlington, Faculty Development Resource Center. Confidential personal consultation is provided to faculty. (Cole, 1978, p. 23)

Gordon College. Each faculty member is interviewed annually by the dean, and then writes his or her own "growth contract." The contract specifies goals, procedures, and evaluation of each instructor's professional development plan. (Gaff, 1975, p. 91, Bergquist, 1978, p. 24, and Smith, 1976, pp. 62-67)

Hampshire College, Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation. There is no tenure at Hampshire. Faculty make "growth contracts" which include duties, expectations, responsibilities, accountability, and academic privileges. (Gerth, 1973, pp. 84)

Defiance College. Untenured faculty meet with department chairpersons in the fall to have their responsibilities described, and in the spring to describe their strengths and weaknesses. For weakness, the causes and the possible and proposed remedies are included. (Karman, 1969)

Macalester College, Auditor-Consultant Program. Two faculty members from related disciplines observe each other teach, and then tutor each other about the latest developments in their fields. (Gaff, 1975, p. 30)

Texas Tech University. Using a peer clinical supervision model, small teams of faculty observe each other's teaching, provide feedback, and develop a plan for improvement. (Skoog and Denham, 1979)

Evergreen State College. In a peer evaluation approach, a faculty member spends at least a day with a colleague, observing and gaining insight into his or her professional activities. (Bergquist, 1978, p. 20)

University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. Faculty members offer noncredit courses to colleagues in their subject matter and in teaching techniques. (Cole, 1978, p. 23)

Regional Council for International Education. Four times a year the council brought delegates from 25 colleges and universities to hear two days of outstanding lectures on international developments. Participants benefited from informal interaction with each other as well as from the lectures. (Noonan, 1973, p. 95)

California State University, Northridge, Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. Faculty members selected by the president are assigned quarter-time to the institute. They spend a half-day a week in ongoing discussions of topics of interest. (Gaff, 1975, p. 32)

Stanford University, Center for Teaching and Learning. Workshops are offered on interdisciplinary teaching, its intellectual and pedagogical issues. (Gaff, 1975, p. 31)

Macalester College, Faculty Community Internship Program. Faculty members are assigned part-time for a year to community businesses and organizations, and later incorporate some aspect of their experience into their teaching. (Gaff, 1975, p. 31)

Kansas City Regional Center for Higher Education. Serving 2500 faculty members, the center provides services to 1) help upgrade teaching performance; 2) increase administrative effectiveness; 3) help faculty at all points in their professional life cycle; and 4) share information. (Smith, 1976, pp. 46-49, and Gaff, 1975, p. 37)

College Center of the Finger Lakes (a five-school consortium). Participants were given a two-hour interview in which they took stock of themselves as teachers. Then they took part in a week-long workshop in which mornings were devoted to personal development, afternoons to instructional development, and evenings to organizational development. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 27-28)

Wright Institute. Depth interviews were held with faculty members and analyzed by the staff. The collective results were used in small groups, in which faculty learned that others have similar concerns. (Gaff, 1975, p. 37)

Michigan State University, Educational Development Program. Faculty members propose instructional-improvement projects. After judging a project innovative, generalizable and capable of being evaluated, the Program aids in the development and trial of the project. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 58-60)

Orgeon State University, College and University Teaching Project. This instructional development project had a year-long cycle: 1) a three-week workshop on instructional methods and design; 2) a two-month phase of designing a conprehensive plan of instruction; 3) a materials development phase; 4) a two-day evaluation phase in which participants reported on their projects. (Osterman, 1976)

Syracuse University, Center for Instructional Development. Working with departments or teams, the center staff selects an instructional improvement project, creates an "ideal" and then a "real" design, and plans for the implementation and evaluation of the project. (Bergquist, 1978, p. 22, and Smith, 1976, pp. 37-40)

California State University, Fresno, Task Force on Faculty Development. The task force works with university committees and administrators to review personnel practices. (Gaff, 1975, p. 92)

National Training Laboratory Institute. Through off-campus workshops, the institute trained volunteer teams of faculty on systematic and reflective planning and implementation of campus projects. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 85-86)

University of Cincinnati, Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education. The institute staff provides training, consultation, and research services to faculty, administration, staff and students. It initially began with students and faculty. Now it also operates from the "top" down, working with unit leaders and then members to promote their problem-solving effectiveness. (Gaff, 1975, pp. 83-84)

Impact

Gaff (1975) and Hoyt and Howard (1978) have acknowledged the paucity of evaluations of faculty development programs. Gaff surveyed over fifty program directors; thirty claimed that their programs had been systematically evaluated. However, it appeared that many such evaluations were positively oriented descriptions of the program's services and the users' satisfactions. There is little attention to measuring impact. (p. 162)

Hoyt and Howard's studies are notable exceptions. In two universities' programs they found that increases in student ratings of professors' teaching were related to participation in faculty development. In their tentative conclusions Hoyt and Howard stated their expectations for future findings. The impact of programs will be greater on those faculty who are already fairly successful and are motivated to volunteer for assistance. Changes in teaching behavior will be relatively modest. Some faculty members will feel threatened by programs. Studies of impact need to look at the match between the professor's activities and his or her skills and preferences. Hoyt and Howard's conclusions

generally echo Gaff's discussion of impact three years earlier.

Current Issues

In a 1977 article addressing the state of the art of faculty development, Gaff reflected on what he called "a major preoccupation throughout higher education during the past few years." (p. 512) He cited the large number of recently established programs, the variety of approaches which have proven valuable, the major funding by foundations, the publication of new development materials and professional literature, and the success of conferences to train staff developers. He noted the creation of the Network for Professional and Organizational Development and a new periodical, Facu ty Evaluation and Development Newspaper. (pp. 512-13)

The spurt of interest has been called a fad by some critics. Gaff acknowledged the possibility, and discussed need for accomplishments in several areas in order to carry the movement beyond its initial momentum.

1. Current efforts must be institutionalized, i.e., owned, funded and valued by their own colleges and universities.
2. The creation of a new unit, center, or institute can not be an end in itself.
3. Evaluations need to be conducted.
4. Administrators will have to infuse their work with sensitivity and skill in promoting faculty development.
5. Programs must serve institutional as well as individual needs.
6. The personal aspirations and conditions of individual faculty members deserve more attention.
7. Student participation needs to be expanded. (summarized from pp. 514-17)

Responding to Gaff's article, Eble (1977) also expressed satisfaction with current interest in faculty development, and noted that it has the potential for helping institutions address the crucial question of purpose and direction. Unfortunately, its potential is also its problem, the same problem which is

chronic in higher education, i.e., confusion about the meaning and relative importance of research and teaching.

Rice (1977) built on this point, calling for incentives for faculty development to be built into institutional reward systems, with the goal of coordinating institution and individual development. He maintained that faculty vitality is kept alive through opportunities to contribute significantly to program development in the institution. Rice reiterated the necessity of rediscovering the fundamental meaning of higher education.

Massanari recently spoke of the issues involved in faculty development for education professors. (Davies, 1978) Education faculties seem to be less involved in the movement possibly because the improvement of instruction and personal growth are their daily concerns. Massanari lamented education faculties' lack of leadership in providing programs to other departments on campus; education departments have the expertise but not the credibility.

In summary, faculty development is a way of exploring both the ends and means of higher education. Programs will ultimately be successful if they become permanent structures in which personal and institutional purposes are complementary.

Clinical Supervision

The concept and practice of the clinical supervision of teachers is a recent development in the field of supervision. In only a few cases has it been applied to teaching in higher education. This section will first sample general literature which explains the theory and practice of clinical supervision. Then the miniscule body of research on clinical supervision is reviewed. Finally, current issues in the conceptualization of clinical supervision are summarized.

General Literature

Clinical supervision was developed by Morris L. Cogan and his colleagues at Harvard in the late 1950's and early 1960's for beginning M.A.T. students and their cooperating teachers. The first book explaining the rationale and components of this approach was Goldhammer's Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. (1969) From roots in counseling psychology, Goldhammer used his initial chapter as a raw exposure of the state of American classrooms; he provided vivid examples of meaningless and detrimental educational practices. The remainder of the book is devoted to clinical supervision and its possibilities for infusing teaching with meaning and quality. Goldhammer explained the stages of the process, discussed the methods and problems of each stage, and provided extensive transcripts and analysis to exemplify clinical supervision.

For Goldhammer, "clinical" meant "involving face-to-face relationships"; metaphors of illness or manipulation were not implied. The process of

clinical supervision consists of five stages.

> Stage 1, Preobservation conference: At this conference the teacher and supervisor establish rapport. The teacher presents his or her lesson plan to the supervisor and they go over it together, anticipating classroom reality. A "contract" is made between them, specifying the purpose and conditions for supervision.
>
> Stage 2, Observation: While observing the teacher's lesson, the supervisor takes detailed notes about teacher's and students' speech and behavior.
>
> Stage 3, Analysis and Strategy: The supervisor privately analyzes his or her observation notes and plans the following conference.
>
> Stage 4, Supervision conference: The supervisor shares the analysis of observation notes with the teacher, while the teacher takes the opportunity to respond, question, challenge, and explore the supervisor's reactions. In the conference the teacher's past supervision can be reviewed and the future planned. Specific remedies for problems may be planned. Overall professional support is given.
>
> Stage 5, Post-conference analysis: The supervisor analyzes the first four stages and the quality of his or her performance. (summarized from pp. 57-72)

Throughout Goldhammer's book is a strong current of professional respect for teachers, and a valuing of their views of classroom reality. A second edition of the book is authored by Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski. (1980)

Morris L. Cogan's Clinical Supervision appeared in 1973. A strong point in the preface is that his book is for teachers as well as supervisors:

> ....clinical supervision is conceptualized as the interaction of peers and colleagues. It is not unilateral action taken by the supervisor and aimed at the teacher. On the contrary, the teacher is called on to assume almost all the roles and responsibilities of a supervisor in his interaction with the clinical supervisor. He initiates action, proposes hypotheses, analyzes his own performance, shares responsibilities for devising supervisory strategies, and is equally responsible for the maintenance of morale in the supervisory process. (p. xi)

Cogan uses the term clinical supervision to mean supervision based on the supervisor's observation of in-class events, and the intention to improve the teacher's classroom instruction. He described eight phases in the cycle of supervision:

Phase 1: Establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship.

Phase 2: Planning with the teacher. The plan includes objectives for students and teacher, anticipated instructional problems, strategies of teaching, processes of learning, and provisions for feedback and evaluation.

Phase 3: Planning the strategy of observation. The supervisor plans the objectives, processes and arrangements for the observation. The teacher may participate in planning.

Phase 4: Observing instruction.

Phase 5: Analyzing the teaching-learning processes. Teacher and supervisor (initially, separately; later, together) analyze the classroom events observed.

Phase 6: Planning the strategy of the conference. The supervisor, perhaps with the teacher, develops the alternatives and strategies for the conference.

Phase 7: The conference.

Phase 8: Renewed planning. During the conference, the teacher and supervisor decide what changes will be attempted in the teacher's classroom behavior. They begin to plan the next lesson. (summarized from pp. 10-12)

Cogan's book includes chapters on the rationale for clinical supervision, self knowledge to temper judgments, problems of the clinical supervisor, and the character of the teacher-supervisor relationship, as well as on the phases of the supervision cycle.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development referred

briefly to clinical supervision in Supervision in a New Key (Wilhelms, 1973) and has recently published Clinical Supervision: A State of the Art Review (Sullivan, 1980), covering the history, design, research, and strengths and weaknesses of this supervisory approach. Acheson and Gall's Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers (1980) is another general source; it goes into more detail on classroom observational techniques.

Professional journals have devoted thematic issues to the topic of clinical supervision: Journal of Research and Development in Education (Vol.9, Winter 1976) and Contemporary Education (Vol. 49, Fall 1977).

Clinical supervision has been adapted to varying supervisory philosophies. Burke (1977) has attempted to show how management by objectives (MBO), borrowed from business and industry, could be incorporated into the clinical supervision cycle; he referred to the teacher as the "supervisee." Graves and Croft (1976) proposed a system called Empathetic Rational Action as a training program for clinical supervisors; one of their emphases was an empathetic teacher-supervisor relationship "which establishes lines of communication, reduces anxieties, and promotes negotiation and acceptance by each of the values of the other." (pp. 77-78)

At the college and university level there has been limited implementation of clinical supervision. Melnik and Sheehan (1976) described the Clinic to Improve University Teaching, University of Massachusetts, which drew its practice from Cogan's principles. An instructor who consults the clinic is first interviewed by a teaching improvement specialist (a trained graduate student); goals and procedures are clarified and agreed upon. The specialist then gathers information through a variety of means: class observation, class

videotape, instructor's self-assessment, course materials, and student ratings. The data are reviewed by specialist and instructor separately, and then together in order to identify strengths and weaknesses. Suggestions for improvement are considered, based partly on further data collected from students. The instructor has the option of practicing needed skills in a microteaching setting. As he or she uses the skills in class, progress is continually evaluated. Final data are reviewed independently by specialist and instructor, and in a final conference the improvement process is assessed.

Melnik and Sheehan cited several differences between clinical supervision and the Clinic's process. The Clinic's process is built only on 38 specified teaching skills. The teaching improvement specialist is a graduate student, not the instructors' superior. The specialists often give advice, whereas in Cogan's clinical supervision the development of the teacher's independence is key. These adaptations of clinical supervision have proven functional in the Clinic to Improve University Teaching.

The Texas Tech University College of Education has adapted clinical supervision in a different way. Skoog and Denham (1979) have described their peer observation procedures through which teams of three-to-six faculty members observe and provide feedback to each other.

> Stage 1, Preobservation conference: The observee informs the team what will take place in the class. Together the team establishes the logistics of the observation. The special concerns of the observee are noted. The team selects three or four items for its focus.
>
> Stage 2, Observation: The team attends the observee's class, taking as many notes as possible, and perhaps using an observation instrument. The visit lasts 15-20 minutes.

Stage 3, Analysis and strategy session: The team meets without the observee to recreate the events of the class, decide what data to present to the instructor and plan how to conduct the postobservation conference.

Stage 4, Postobservation conference: The team meets with the observee to summarize and critique the observational data.

Stage 5, Clinical review session: Without the observee, the team meets to criticize its own functioning.

Skoog and Denham have noticed a positive impact of the peer observation process on the instructional climate of the college.

Peer clinical supervision among elementary school teachers is reported by Withall and Wood (1979) as being "employed by thousands of teachers and administrators who have been involved in Individually Guided Education." (p. 57) The authors cite two unpublished studies in which teachers showed more positive attitudes toward peer clinical supervision after experiencing a couple of cycles.

Research

Despite the interest in clinical supervision, as evidenced by four major methodological books in the past decade, there has been little research in the area.

Reavis (1978) reviewed the six available studies, several of them unpublished. One study showed that teachers who had experienced clinical supervision had more positive attitudes than teachers under traditional supervision toward the following: communication, conferences, observations, suggestions for improvement, self-perception, and supervisor helpfulness. Some studies showed clinical supervision more effective than no supervision in changing teachers' behaviors and attitudes toward supervision. One study demonstrated that supervisors in clinical supervision

during conferences were higher in the categories "accepts or uses teacher's ideas," and "asks for teacher's opinions" than supervisors implementing traditional supervision. Reavis acknowledges important methodological flaws in most of the studies, but notes that in no studies was traditional supervision favored. He concludes that the weight is on the side of clinical supervision. It is not yet clear why clinical supervision is successful.

Issues

More has been writted about clinical supervision than has been reviewed above. There is a plethora of articles re-explaining the observation cycle and/or speculating about how clinical supervision could be integrated with other models, techniques, or approaches. Several issues and problems remain in the field.

One problem is the connotations of the term "clinical supervision." Krajewski and Anderson in "Goldhammer's Clinical Supervision a Decade Later," suggest that the term itself may be partly responsible for the slow acceptance of the concept. The process may sound cold, formal, and lacking in human contact. (1980)

One concludes, from surveying the literature, that the denotation of the term is by no means agreed upon. Some authors seem to regard "clinical supervision" as the implementation of the five stages. Others look beyond the form to the substance, the purposes and essence of the process, but here they part company. There are varying interpretations of the roles of teacher and supervisor: in some cases clinical supervision is just a more effective means of insuring that teachers acquire particular,

predetermined constructive teaching behaviors; in other cases the focus is on developing teachers' independence in analyzing and improving their own teaching.

Ben Harris, in a cautionary article about the real-world constraints on the implementation of clinical supervision at its band-wagon stage, concluded in 1976 that clinical supervision was in "early adolescence." (p. 89) It appears that now, four years later, clinical supervision has progressed to mid-adolescence: it still isn't sure who it is, and although it boasts of its strength and sings of its visions, it has yet to demonstrate its accomplishments.

Bibliography

Acheson, Keith A., and Gall, Meredith Damien. Techniques in the Clincial Supervision of Teachers. New York: Longman, 1980.

Alexander, L.T., and Yelon, S.L. Instructional Development Agencies in Higher Education. East Lansing: Michigan State University Continuing Education Service, 1972. Cited by Jerry G. Gaff, Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976, p.xii.

Arrowsmith, William. "The Future of Teaching." In Improving College Teaching, pp. 57-71. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Astin, Alexander, W., and Lee, Calvin B. T. "Current Practies in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers." In Improving College Teaching, pp. 296-311. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Axelrod, Joseph. The University Teacher as Artist. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Baird, Leonard. "Common and Uncommon Models for Evaluating Teaching." In Evaluating Learning and Teaching, pp. 77-97. Edited by Robert C. Pace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1973.

Berqquist, William H. "Relationship of Collegiate Professional Development and Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (May-June 1978), 18-24.

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steven R. A Handbook for Faculty Development. Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Burke, Robert L. "Improving Instruction with Management By Objectives and Clincal Supervision." Contemporary Education 49 (Fall 1977), 29-32.

Buxton, Thomas H. and Prichard, Keith W., eds. Excellence in University Teaching. Columbia, S. C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1975.

Centra, John A. "Faculty Development in Higher Education." Teachers College Record 80 (September 1978), 188-201.

Centra, John A. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." Journal of Higher Education 49 (March/April 1978), 151-62.

Change Magazine. The Yellow Pages of Undergraduate Innovations. Cited by Robert C. Wilson, Jerry G. Gaff et al, College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Cogan, Morris L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Cohen, Arthur M.; Rose, Clare; and Trent, James W. "Teaching Technology and Methods." In "Research on Teaching in Higher Education," pp. 1023-35. Edited by James W. Trent and Arthur M. Cohen. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 997-1071. Edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Cohen, Arthur M.; Trent, James W.; and Rose, Clare. "Evaluation of Teaching." In "Research on Teaching in Higher Education," pp. 1041-52. Edited by James W. Trent and Arthur M. Cohen. In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 997-1071. Edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Cole, Charles C. Jr. To Improve Instruction, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 2, 1978. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 153 583, 1978.

Costin, Frank; Greenough, William T.; and Menges, Robert J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness." Review of Educational Research 41 (December 1971), 511-35.

Davis, James R. Teaching Strategies for the College Classroom. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 1976.

Davies, Hopkin. "From The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education: An Interview with the Director." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (May-June 1978), 45-46.

Doyle, Kenneth O. Jr. Student Evaluation of Instruction. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975.

Dreeban, Robert. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970.

Dubin, Robert, and Taveggia, Thomas C. The Teaching-Learning Paradox: A Comparative Analysis of College Teaching Methods. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1968.

Eble, Kenneth. "Response to Jerry Gaff's 'Current Issues in Faculty Development.'" Liberal Education 63 (December 1977), 520-23.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Craft of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Eble, Kenneth E. Professors as Teachers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1972.

Eble, Kenneth E. The Recognition and Evaluation of Teaching. Salt Lake City, Utah, The Project to Improve College Teaching: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 046 350, 1970.

Estrin, Herman A., and Goode, Delmer, M., eds. College and University Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1964.

Freedman, Mervin, ed. Facilitating Faculty Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. 1973.

Gaff, Jerry G. "Current Issues in Faculty Development." Liberal Education 63 (December 1977), 511-19.

Gaff, Jerry G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Gerth, Donald R. "Institutional Approaches to Faculty Development." In Facilitating Faculty Development, pp. 83-92. Edited by Mervin Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973.

Goldhammer, Robert. Clinical Supervision. Special Methods for the Supervison of Teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Goldhammer, Robert; Anderson, Robert H.; and Krajewski, Robert J. Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Graves, Audrey S., and Croft, John C. "ERA (Empathetic Rational Action): Refinement and Specification of Process Model and Development of Introductory Training Model for Clinical Supervision." Journal of Research and Development in Education 9 (Winter 1976), 77-84.

Gustad, John W. "Evaluation of Teaching Performance: Issues and Possibilities." In Improving College Teaching, pp. 265-81. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Harris, Ben M. "Limits and Supplements to Formal Clinical Procedures." Journal of Research and Development in Education 9 (Winter 1976) 85-89.

Highet, Gilbert. The Art of Teaching. New York; Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

Hildebrand, Milton, and Wilson, Robert C. Effective University Teaching and Its Evaluation. Berkeley, University of California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 039 860, 1970.

Hoyt, Donald P., and Howard, George S. "The Evaluationof Faculty Development Programs." Research in Higher Education. 8,1 (1978), 25-38.

Karman, Thomas A. "Faculty Evaluation." Liberal Education 55 (December 1969), 539-44.

Kelley, William Frederick. "Twenty Studies of Inservice Education of College Faculty and the Procedures Most Recommended." Educational Administration 36 (1950), 351-58.

Krajewski, Robert J., and Anderson, Robert H. "Goldhammer's Clinical Supervision a Decade Later." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980): 420-23.

Kulik, James A., and Kulik, Chen-Lin C. "College Teaching." In Research on Teaching, pp. 70-93. Edited by Penelope L. Peterson and Herbert J. Walberg. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Lee, Calvin B. T., ed. Improving College Teaching Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Mann, Richard. In Memo to the Faculty, vol. 45 (August 1971), p. 2. Cited by William H. Bergquist and Steven R. Phillips, A Handbook for Faculty Development. Washington, D. C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Mc Carthy, Joseph L. "In-Service Improvement of College Teachers." In College and University Teaching, pp. 597-604. Edited by Herman A. Estrin and Delmer M. Goode. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1964.

McGrath, Earl J. "Superior Teaching in the Colleges of the Sixties." In College and University Teaching, pp. 548-62. Edited by Herman A. Estrin and Delmer M. Goode. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1964.

McKeachie, W. J. "Research in Teaching: The Gap Between Theory and Practice." In Improving College Teaching, pp. 211-39. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Melnik, Michael A., and Sheehan, Daniel S. "Clinical Supervision Elements: The Clinic to Improve University Teaching." Journal of Research and Development in Education 9 (Winter 1976) 67-76.

Miller, Richard I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.,1972.

Milton, Ohmer. Alternatives to the Traditional. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Milton, Ohmer, and Associates. On College Teaching:A Guide to Contemporary Practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Nisbet, Robert A. "Conflicting Academic Loyalties." In Improving College Teaching, pp. 12-34. Edited by Calvin B. T. Lee. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Noonan, John F. "Faculty Development through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation." In Facilitating Faculty Development, pp. 93-103. Edited by Mervin Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Osterman, Dean N., and others. Improving Undergraduate Teaching Through a Faculty Development Program. Oregon State University: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 122 836, 1976.

Pace, Robert C., ed. Evaluating Learning and Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1973.

Ralph, Norbert, and Freedman, Mervin. "Innovative Colleges: Challenge to Faculty Development." In Facilitating Faculty Development, pp. 69-82. Edited by Mervin Freedman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973.

Reavis, Charles A. "Research in Review/Clinical Supervision: A Review of Research." Educational Leadership 35 (April 1978) 580-84.

Rice, R. Eugene. "Response to Jerry Gaff's 'Current Issues in Faculty Development.'" Liberal Education 63 (December 1977), 524-28.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of Teachers, Their Description Comparison, and Appraisal, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1960. Cited by James W. Trent and Arthur M. Cohen, "Research on Teaching in Higher Education." In Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, pp. 997-1071. Edited by Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Skoog, Gerald, and Denham, Alice. "Peer Observation Procedures for Improving the Quality of College Instruction." Texas Tech Journal of Education. 6-1 (1979), 21-30.

Smith, Albert B. Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 8, 1976. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976.

Sullivan, Cheryl Granade. Clinical Supervision: A State of the Art Review. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

Wilhelms, Fred T. Supervision in a New Key. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1973.

Wilson, Robert C., and Gaff, Jerry G. et al. College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Withall, John, and Wood, Fred H. "Taking the Threat Out of Classroom Observation and Feedback." Journal of Teacher Education 30 (January - February 1979): 55-58.